97-84050-9

Dabney, Charles William

The vital element in social progress

[S.l.]

[1914?]

97-84050-9
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 130

Dabney, Charles William, 1855-1945
The vital element in social progress; a baccalaureate address delivered at the University of Cincinnati on June 7, 1914, by President Charles William Dabney ...
cover-title, 15 p. 22½ cm.

Reprinted from the University of Cincinnati record, vol. X, no. 4, October, 1914.

Only ed

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-25-97 INITIALS: MS

TRACKING # : 22622

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

THE VITAL ELEMENT IN SOCIAL PROGRESS

A BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI ON JUNE 7, 1914, BY PRESIDENT CHARLES WILLIAM DABNEY

Reprinted from the University of Cincinnati Record, Vol. X, No. 4, October, 1914

Sept 15 1921

*THE VITAL ELEMENT IN SOCIAL PROGRESS

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS

BY PRESIDENT CHARLES W. DABNEY

June 7, 1914

Every age, if it is to be productive, must have a gospel. What is the gospel of this age? It is, I think, the gospel of service; we, today, believe not in doctrines merely, but in deeds; not in creeds merely, but in character; not in scholarship only, but in service. At last we are coming to believe in brotherhood, also, and to practice it a little. This change of view appears in politics, and gives rise to workmen's compensation acts; it appears in business, and gives us a new creed of the trusteeship of wealth. It is persuading lawyers and judges to modify their slow procedure and dead formulas in the interests of a prompter justice, and it is leading the clergy to open their churches for social service. It is bringing educators to arrange their courses so that the average youth may be fitted for the average duties in life. We are beginning to realize that the chief end of education is not the giving of a smattering of knowledge or the development of intellectual power merely, but is also the formation of character, trained and habituated to think in terms of social obligations. The perfection of the social mind, the social conscience, the social heart—this, and nothing less, should be the chief aim in education.

Tested by such a criterion, this University is training men rightly; for not only is the interest in social service growing among us, but the works of social service are multiplying. No class I have known in any institution has shown such intelligent interest in social service as has this class of 1914. You are zealous to improve the condition of your people, and you want to know how it is to be done. Amidst the many programs proposed by a multitude of reformers of all degrees of intelligence and ignorance, of sanity and insanity, you are anxious to find the right way. Shall it be through legislation or sanitation, through some new method of distributing wealth, or wholly through moral agencies? Shall it be by physical improvements in living conditions, or shall it be

*Reprinted from the University of Cincinnati Record, Vol. X, No. 4, October, 1914.

through education solely, that we are to bring about this social renewal? You have not much faith in sumptuary laws or mechanical methods, and you are deeply desirous of getting the power that is to energize all these efforts to develop the people.

What is the power in human progress? You have been taught that there are two theories of human society—the individualist theory and the realist theory. The former regards society as a collection of separate units, the aggregate of all the individual people, and the sum of their actual relations. From this point of view, the word "society" is only a collective term, a convenient name for a multitude of separate persons inter-related in complex ways—by blood, laws, customs, languages, literature and industry. We call this the individualist theory because it looks upon the separate individual in his many relations as the only concrete reality.

This theory of society is wrong; just as wrong as it would be to define McMicken Hall as a pile of bricks. This building is more than a pile of bricks, for it was erected upon certain structural principles in accordance with certain natural laws, or it would not stand. It is more than brick walls, in that it was built for certain educational uses. To us it is more even than a spacious college building, for it has been the scene of our earnest labors and happy associations, and therefore will always be the object of our affection. To the people of this city, it is more than a pile of bricks, because it is adapted to a noble public use, and is the concrete symbol of the hopes of many of its youth. The individualist view of this structure, which sees in it only a collection of bricks of the hardness and shape that bricks ought to have, fixed in the relations in which bricks are usually laid, is a theory applicable only to some fire-blasted wall waiting to be torn down. If such a theory were possessed of any practical force, it could lead only to destruction.

Now, just as McMicken Hall is more than a mere pile of bricks, so human society differs from a collection of individuals and their relations. Society is not simply the sum total of all the people together with the sum total of their mutual relations; it is something vastly different and far greater. We are, therefore, compelled to adopt that other view which considers society as a real thing on its own account, with a plan of its own, a life of its own, principles of its own, and functions of its own different from, and more important than, any of its parts. This we call the realist theory of society.

You have been taught that society is a living organism like this body of ours. To say that man is a mere collection of cells, together with the sum of their relations and functions, may be a satisfactory description of the body after life has left it and it has fallen into decay. But the living organism has a life of its own far surpassing the innumerable lives of the cells which the histologist sees, or of the organs whose functions the physiologist studies.

I have recalled these familiar principles because it is important that we have correct views about the nature of society if we are to be successful social servants. All our methods of speaking with regard to social matters, and, in fact, all our principles with regard to every human interest, will depend upon whether we hold the one or the other of these opposite theories. From the individualist point of view, the observer sees so many millions of separate human units, possessing characteristic traditions, customs, resources, languages and literatures. The realist, on the contrary, perceives that he is a member of a concrete, living, growing organism of marvelous structure, from which he was lately born, and in the service of which he must find his immortality. This, for him, is humanity; this is society.

He perceives, also, that this organism, of which he is a part, has for its home a beautiful world of hills and plains, rivers and roads, houses and gardens, fields and cities, churches and graves, monuments and memorials, existing here long before any of his fellows were born, and destined to continue long after they are all dead. These constitute the foundation and framework of humanity, the factors of human society. The traditions, histories, customs and laws of his country, its manner of thinking and ways of feeling, its romance and its poetry, its religion and its philosophy, are from generation to generation. Each man, besides being the son of this wonderful organism, is a part of this material and spiritual environment; but how partially and for how brief a time! Such things, more than ephemeral individuals, constitute society. Governments, social organizations, and institutions, with their systems of mutual duties, fidelities, and affections, their standards of honor and respect, their prides of valor and of virtue, all these elements and many more—too refined and delicate to be disentangled—are the web and woof of the wonderful fabric of society.

To this higher and continuing life, man belongs more completely and intimately than to mother and father, to wife

and children, for to them he belongs only because he is of it —the Continuing Life. He is like an oak, born of millions of trees in ages past, with its thousands of roots in the soil, and myriads of leaves in the sunshine. It produces in its time thousands of acorns, containing the germs of countless trees to come. He is not only the son of all the past, but the father of all the future. Human society is thus a part of the great universe of Nature herself, and not an affair of arrangement. It is a living, and not a mechanical thing; the work of creation, and not of man. Is the life of these trees and this grass in the parks of one origin, and the life of this company of men and women of another? Is the beauty of these hills covered with verdure and of this river flowing calmly yonder of one origin, and the beauty of these homes filled with mothers and children of another? If all these natural things on the earth—the blooming plants and the breathing animals, the powers and affections of men—if all these things are works of creation, then human society, the union of all these, aside from which we have no life, emanates from no other source.

Take, for illustration, our own society here in this beautiful land. Think of the patient patriotism, the valor and virtue, the labor and love of all the innumerable millions which have gone to the making of America. What human mind has been the designer or the architect of our country? What lawyer, historian or dramatist conceived the character or planned the achievements of the Pilgrims, the pioneers, the soldiers, or the builders of this great country, and of this, our own Cincinnati? Who gave birth to and trained the Cincinnati? Who directed their thoughts when they made a new constitution containing principles never dreamed of by men before? What power taught the legislators, judges, physicians, soldiers, and teachers, who have guided and protected the American people down to this day? It is plain that all things of this order come from above. Like all natural things, but far more than any other creation, human society is the reflection of Divine perfection. The mirror is polished by unskillful man, and as he improves it, the reflection of the stars becomes more and more true to the heavenly pattern.

The natural origin of these things, now too often forgotten among us, was, in ancient days, recognized by all people; and human society has everywhere, in all times, flourished best where its Divine origin has been most understood. Which, for example, did more for humanity, the Hebrew theory that

society was made by God, or the Roman system of man-made laws? Which has done more for our modern society, the Reformation, which taught men that, as sons of God, they should be free, or the French Revolution, which taught them that, as soulless animals, they should consider only self?

This doctrine of the unity and continuity of life and its progressive development was taught by all the prophets and philosophers and poets from Job to our time. God said to Job, "Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine." Daniel declared, "His Kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and his Dominion is from generation to generation." In the words of Jesus, "So the Kingdom of God is as if a man cast seed into the ground and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow and he knew not how, for the earth brought forth fruit of herself, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." Taking up the inspiring theme, St. Paul says, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, all the members of that one body, being one, are one body."

The unity and continuity of society is the teaching of all philosophers, too, from Plato to Darwin. According to Plato, every individual thing is transitory, living out its brief cycle of existence, fulfilling its part, and then giving place to its successor. The continuing process is thus an infinitely higher reality than the individual thing which it produced, for it furnished all the reality of the thing while it lasted, and, finally, furnished all the reality of its successor.

Browning's "Paracelsus," written a quarter of a century before Darwin's "Origin" was published, contains one of the most precise expressions on social evolution that has ever been put forward. "Man is not man yet," says Paracelsus, "but by the power of love shall develop into something ever nobler." In another place, Browning says,

> "Ah! world as God made it! Truth is beauty,
> And knowing this is love, and love is duty."

Our evolutionary theory is based on the doctrine that each individual is "The heir of all the ages."

Tennyson's philosophical poetry is written from the point of view of evolution.

> "Man as yet is being made, and ere the crowning Age of ages,
> Shall not aeon after aeon pass and touch him into shape."

Evolution is the star of the poet's hope and love the power that binds society together.

"Follow you the star that lights a desert pathway, yours or mine,
Forward, till you see the highest Human Nature is divine.
Follow Light and do the Right—for man can half-control his doom—
Till you find the deathless Angel seated in the vacant tomb.
Forward, let the stormy moment fly and mingle with the past.
I that loathed have come to love him. Love will conquer at the last."

Thus it is that the realist theory fills us with hope, while the other theory sinks us in pessimism. For real society, with a life of its own, rooted in the eternal past, is capable always of renewal and fruitfulness. However bad our situation—and indeed it is bad enough—faith in God and nature gives us dauntless hope.

Therefore, if we would accomplish anything for society, we must work in accordance with the eternal laws of nature and the Creator, else our effort is not merely failure, but injury. On the other hand, every submission to the law of society, every love of it, every suffering and every sacrifice for it, is working together with nature in producing beneficent results. Thus, the realist view renews and builds up society, while the individualist theory destroys the cement which binds society together, and leaves it to drop into dust.

Everybody agrees, theoretically at least, that, if we were only to observe the two great precepts which command that we love God and our neighbor, all social disorders would soon be at an end. But how few people live up to this faith! Why is this? In the first place, we fail to recognize sufficiently that our world is alive already with just this heavenly charity and its fruit. People are by no means as selfish as some of their acts would indicate. In the fields of educational, social, and religious work, the true method of social restoration, for which we are pleading, is actually being carried out upon a prodigious scale and with prodigious effect. Where homes already flourish in which industry, patience, contentment, and love go hand in hand; in which thrifty management, domestic skill, and sincere hospitality make social life wholesome; in which healthy children are born and trained to usefulness—in such homes, we know at once that the law of love rules. Where communities already exist, in which each man has honest work and proper pay, where the schools are teaching the children how to live as well as to learn from books, where

the churches have forgotten their creeds sufficiently to work together—where such communities, such families, and such churches exist, there we perceive that the law of love for one's neighbor is enforced.

These beautiful results are not produced by legislation, by administration, by visiting lecturers, or by philanthropic committees and social workers, after the plan of the individualists, all of which, so far as the desired results are concerned, are apt to be perfectly worthless. They are produced, however, by the simple everyday service of loving our neighbors. If we desire, then, to multiply these results, we must desire first the re-enforcement and liberation of their natural, proper, and historic cause, which is a fuller realization of the supreme precept to love one's neighbor as one's self.

While we are taking for granted that the people have no effective desire for charity, a vast number have, in fact, no other desire at all, and are prepared to lose everything, and to suffer anything, if only thereby they may do something to unite themselves with the heart of this great problem. The masses of our American people are, in fact, sick of these quackeries and sophistries, and hungry for the truth and reality of life and service. They do not believe that legislatures and congresses can do for them that which they have to do for themselves, and they do not expect permanent results from agitation.

The political parties which propose to answer these social questions with legislation are beginning at the wrong end. The social problem cannot be solved by legislatures and congresses, but by homes and local communities. By legislation we may remove some of the opportunities for oppression and temptations to crime, and we should do this by all means, but we should never forget that we cannot by legislation teach people to love their neighbors. While legislative expedients and such things are helpful, they are subject to endless change, and the hope that the external conditions of social welfare will ever, at any time or in any country, be perfected and fixed is illusory. So far as a general security and richness of life have existed in any age, they have been the fruits of social vitality and this vitality is the product of good will. It is the other way around; instead of good government and economic conditions producing social welfare and good will, it is good will which produces good government and better economic conditions.

Why can we not understand that the substance of health and fruitfulness has objective reality, and that just as the growth and fruitfulness of plants in a hothouse depend on the amount of sunlight, so all good things in human existence depend upon the amount of love that is liberated to flow throughout society.

Then, if expedients and regulations and legislation will not save society, what is the method of social redemption? Having, as we said, a body and life of its own, the social organism has vitality, health, and usefulness, just as it may have disease and senile decay. As society may be young, so may it be old. The great question then is, If society is sick, can it be cured? If it becomes old, can it renew its youth? The answer of history is re-assuring. We have seen it actually renewed time and time again, and always under the influence of religion. We have seen society corrupted with the disease of Babylon and restored by the Hebrew prophets; we have seen it strangled to death under the cruel tyranny of the Roman Empire, and saved by Christianity; we have seen it smothered with ignorance and superstition and revived by the Reformation.

What, then, is the meaning of these miraculous renewals of life in society? As the sunlight revives the life in the trees and grass each spring, so love and good will make young again the mind and heart of man and nation. As the health of every creature depends on the completeness with which it fulfills the end of its being, we may expect the renewal of society only in proportion as its members honor and obey God. For only thus do we escape from bondage into "the glorious liberty of the children of God." All good things—personal liberty, real wealth, distributed prosperity, happy homes, manliness and womanliness—all virtues, are one living unity and spring from this one vital force. This old and true way is natural, not artificial. It is universally valid, infinitely germinal, and though such things may help or hinder, as good or bad culture helps or hinders the seed, it is vitally effective, irrespective of forms of government, acts of legislation, and economic or historical differences.

Religion is, therefore, the foundation of all human culture. There is no noble literature without religion; there is no real poetry without religion; there is no true philosophy without religion. In all high art there is a religious element. All great music has a religious note. In the recent May Festival, all the music had a strong religious feeling, and more than half of it was church music. We have few grander

compositions than Bach's Mass in D minor, while Beethoven's Ninth Symphony is profoundly religious. His battle hymns are the songs of soldiers of liberty. In that stirring fourth movement, the youthful soldiers march to battle singing songs that recall Goethe's words:

> "He only has the right to freedom and delight,
> Who daily is compelled to conquer them."

In the concluding ode, we hear the victorious soldiers sing:

> "Millions, loving, I embrace you.
> All the world, this kiss I send.
> Brothers, o'er yon starry tent,
> Dwells a God whose love is true."

The way to renew our deteriorating literature is not to thresh over its dead straw and to endow letters, but to renew social life and set free its vitality. The way to renew our decadent art is not to make absurd experiments in Futurism or Cubism, but to realize good will and so renew the vision of the people. Thus, the only way to clothe the waste places, to relieve the destitution of the people, and to make them hopeful and give them children in their homes, is again the same old way; it is to give them life and life more abundantly.

Can, then, society renew its youth? It is the children who renew perpetually the perpetually aging race. For social renewal we must have healthy children, and such children are not born under poverty and oppression. Such children are born of love and thrive only in an atmosphere of good will, and in them is the promise of a regenerated people. Salvation is not far away; it is here already in these little ones. Their wholesome spirit, in which love and action are one, is actually the youth so necessary for the nation. We ourselves need only to become as little children to be assured that the Kingdom of Heaven is here.

It was thus that the gospel of good will renovated human life twenty centuries ago to the freshness of a June dawn. It raised woman to a new dignity, recreated the family, restored labor to an honorable place, united its members in a brotherhood of love, and inspired the whole race with a youth felt to this day to the ends of the earth.

We hear it often said that it does not much matter what a man believes, so long as he does what is right. Ah! but it certainly does matter very much indeed to human society what people believe. As the teachings that we are members of one another built up that ancient society, so these indi-

vidualistic teachings have accelerated the undoing of society. Since men have been taught, generation after generation, that these noble principles which had historically made for supreme interior union were worthless, progressive retrogression has been rapidly going on. When, contrary to the most majestic teachings that were ever made in this world, men were told that submission to the bond of unity and the love that suffers all things were no longer necessary; when they were taught that the actions and sufferings that do most to strengthen human brotherhood, such as the pain of bearing each other's burdens, had, after all, no significance in preserving society; when, in other words, men ceased to make practical application of their religion in their social relations, it was inevitable that dissolution should follow. For the purpose of society, it is necessary, not that individuals should merely feel and act benevolently in society in general, but that they should subordinate their own interests, abandon themselves, and lose themselves in the people around them. This is the only interior union, this is the only kind of love of neighbor, which really builds society.

For any restoration of real love of neighbor, producing this inner force of unity, we must, however, look elsewhere than to the increase of a mere compassionate feeling of general beneficent regard directed to the welfare of society. We must have something more effective than this "social sense" of which people talk so much now-a-days, which seems to take effect in nothing except expedients and legislation. True love of neighbor is something better and more genuine than mere sentimentality; it is not a habit of mere sensibility; it is a habit of will; it is a matter of principle. For this reason, then, before we can do much to restore society, we must go back to the old teaching, "Faith. Hope and Charity; but the greatest of these is Charity."

If, then, we must look to religion to bind our society together, to educate people to love their brethren, as is necessary in order to live together in peace and harmony, what is our place in the problem, what is our duty in the case?

The realist theory and the individualist theory, respectively, lead us to very different conclusions with regard to our place in the social program. There are two different methods of service, one of which is true and beneficent, the other, illusory. The first, the realist method, teaches us to recognize our position of dependence as sons in the family of Nature, and so to become lost in the corporate structure of society,

just as the soldier is lost in his regiment, or the child is lost in his family, or a mother forgets herself in her children. The other, the individualist method, leads us to assume a place outside nature and outside the family of men, from which to judge, inspect, and regulate our poor neighbors, and to coerce them into fitting in with our preconceived notions and schemes, we, at the same time, seeking for ourselves, as far as possible, all the good that we can from their service and cooperation. These are incompatible methods of social service, and our choice between them will depend upon what we consider to be our place in the problem, or what we consider to be our relation to our fellow human beings. Our choice will depend upon whether we have this vital principle, charity, in our hearts.

Who are we, after all, that we should undertake to direct the society of the world? Those who realize how completely dependent they are upon God and nature, and how utterly indebted they are to their own particular country, and have considered her beauty and patience and know that they are as the mere dust of her roads, would no more attempt to reform her than they would attempt to change her mountains into plains or her valleys into hills. They know too well that the intellect of man can never solve the mysteries of her being. For them Love will take precedence of Understanding, and Understanding will by no means dictate the methods and the limits of Love. Their own manner of living will be to them the first problem. For it is certain that in so far as men and women live as God meant them to live, they thereby perform their greatest service to society, and thereby, also, themselves become the solution of the social problem. Righteousness in the life of the individual is in itself the complete and perfect solution of the social problem. In fact, there is no other solution.

Humility is the first quality of the true citizen. We must recognize, first of all, that we are each of us subordinate to society and cannot possibly escape from that position. We cannot, as the reformers attempt to do, stand outside and judge it from the point of view of one who feels himself omniscient. That may be the right way of procedure for the machinist who has to correct the errors of a broken or disordered machine; it may be the correct way for the surgeon who stands over his patient as he operates upon him; but it is no way for men and women, who are themselves elements of a community disordered in these many sad ways. For

these disorders among our neighbors, whatever they may be, affect ourselves. In their disorders we are disordered; in their sin we have sinned, and in their death we shall die. The reformer cannot get outside of his community and his impression that he does get beyond it, is simply a wicked dream. He assumes that he or his class or his party is free from the evil with which he attempts to deal. Yet, the only thing that he can be sure of, is that he himself and his party are thoroughly infected with it; if society has a disease, then he may count upon having it also.

We, naturally, imagine that it is the other people always who are causing all the trouble. People of easy circumstances, for example, consider social problems purely as problems of poverty, not as the problems of the rich. The poor, on the other hand, always consider the social problem as a problem of the monopoly of riches, to be remedied by a more equal distribution of wealth. May not better results be obtained by the old Socratic method of knowing ourselves? Certain it is, that the only way in which we can serve society, is by remaining members of it, recognizing our place in the ranks, and doing our work alongside our brethren every day as duty tells us. Everyone wants to doctor society these days, and society is fairly sick with their drugs and expedients. No drug will cure the ills of society; no mere expedient will make people better. The only thing that will cure society is a change of heart in the people as a whole.

Do not, however, misunderstand me. The instinct of the amateur social reformer is a sound one, though often misinterpreted and misguided. He is led by a noble desire which is normally satisfied only when the individual is in close corporate relation with others within the structure of real society. He is then a real member of the body, an organic part of the life of society, and feels that he is so, and his hunger to be united to the whole is then satisfied. But, alas! this progressive breaking down of society has now brought us in a position in which there are many people who have no corporate relations, or find the relations in which they stand intolerable, and so reject them. These people are the miserable victims of this individualist theory, operating unchecked as it has for several generations. They have become members dismembered. Their hunger for some touch with real life, in order that they may have some real life of their own, is often intense. They hunger for union with human society, and cannot find it in the wretched conditions around them. Such people may have

a genuine desire, and yet their work may be wretchedly inadequate or even hurtful.

A large and increasing number, through no fault of their own, are thus cut off from vital relations with the social body which they would like to serve. Desiring ardently to unite themselves with humanity, and yet having no effective station in which they can do so, they go out and begin new agitations and new campaigns for absurd causes. At best these people only see the surface symptoms of social disease and are insensible or uninformed with regard to the graver causes behind them. They are utterly unconscious of the social disintegration, of the principles that cause it, and of the superlative need of that devoted service which alone restores society. In other words, they are not religious, and, therefore, they are not and never can be really effective saviors of mankind. To think of social interest as apart from religion, to think of life as distinct from other work, to think of a life of social service as distinct from other ways of life, shows not a genuine social sense, but a dangerous insensibility to the real claims of society. For all work, life, thought, affection, suffering, and sacrifice, are either social service or dis-service. Living for our neighbor and for our country is the vocation, not of some here and there, but of all; it is not one special work among other tasks, but includes, unites, and absorbs the life of all. Remember, that He who said: "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death" also said: "Let us not love in word or in tongue but in deed and in truth."

Where, then, is our place in the social problem? What is our particular task? It is neither above nor beneath society, but is found in its midst. It is just where we are, loving and helping our neighbor along the way. For social service is not all teaching, preaching and healing; it is doing the plain man's job. The man who ploughs a good furrow, or plants grain properly and cuts it clean, or who bakes an honest loaf of bread, is doing social service just as much as he who organizes a new society or builds a hospital. So far from doing common work, these men are, in fact, working sacramental miracles by co-operating with the mysterious power of God, in satisfying the wants of living men. To spend ourselves freely, unquestioningly, uncomplainingly—this is to do our part of social service.

> **"The common problem, yours, mine, everyone's,**
> **Is—not to fancy what were fair in life,**
> **Provided it could be—but finding first,**
> **What may be, then find how to make it fair—**
> **Up to our means."**

Finally, what is the lesson in this for us? I have sought to show you, as Fichte said, that "There is but a single virtue, to forget one's self as an individual. There is but a single vice, to love one's self as a unit." To serve humanity, we must love humanity; to love humanity, we must believe in the unity and the continuity of humanity. That is, we must have a faith and a hope, a religion.

Now, let us apply this. We all love Cincinnati. We love not merely these hills, these trees, and the grassy carpet that binds them all together, but we love the people who have done so much for us, and we truly desire to do something for them in return. We have heard much in recent years in detraction of Cincinnati, and it grieves us. Thus we ask ourselves, what can we do for our city? If we have learned anything today, we have learned that it is not enough to disapprove of Cincinnati, and, in that case, to move to Louisville or else to cut our throats; nor is it enough to approve of it, for then Cincinnati would remain the bad Cincinnati they say it is, which would indeed be terrible. The only way out of it is for some one to love Cincinnati and to cherish it unselfishly and without any material consideration whatever.

Do you wish to help build upon these hills a "City Beautiful" indeed? Then remember that nothing truly beautiful was ever built in this world except by love. The selfish longing for immortal fame led Egyptian kings to construct great pyramids, which, while grand, are not beautiful. Pride of conquest led Roman emperors to build triumphal arches, which, though highly decorated, are not inspiring. All men agree, however, that the most beautiful structure on this earth is the Taj Mahal, built by Shah Jehan for love of his wife. So, if there arose a man who loved Cincinnati, then Cincinnati would arise with ivory towers and golden pinnacles and beautiful minarets. Decoration is never meant to hide the horrible, but to give charm to that which is already adorable in itself. The mother does not give her child a beautiful garment because it is ugly without it, but because she loves the child. Oh, if men only loved Cincinnati as mothers love their children, arbitrarily and unselfishly, Cincinnati, in a century, might be fairer than Florence! This, my friends, is not a fancy, it is a fact of history. This is the only way in which cities ever grew great and beautiful. Dig down to the darkest roots of the tree of civilization and you will find them always knotted around some sacred stone or entwined about some holy fountain. Men first paid honor to a spot and afterwards

made glory for it. Men did not love Rome because she was great. She was great because they first loved her.

You desire to make Cincinnati a "City Beautiful." You wish to dedicate yourselves to making the lives of this people richer and happier. Then love Cincinnati and her people! And to love her, you must believe in her, in her unity, in her continuity, and in her eternal worth as the home of immortal men. This, I know, is your faith and your hope. We thank God that through all the years there have been those who loved our city and labored for her. If this were not so, this would not be the great and happy place it is today. If men and women had not toiled for Cincinnati through the decades past, we would not have today this great institution, these noble schools, these sacred churches, and these great hospitals, all for the welfare and development of this people.

I beg you then, my friends, to join the army of lovers of Cincinnati, to which belonged in former days the Daniel Drakes, the Rufus Kings, the Nicholas Longworths, the Reuben Springers, the Alexander Fergusons, and the others who built institutions or safeguarded the precious interests of this people. I charge you to study their services and direct your lives by theirs, for they had the Faith, the Hope, and the Charity which are the vital elements in human progress.

END OF
TITLE